



1-22-07

IPU

PTO/SB/21 (07-06)

Approved for use through 09/30/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	10/602,938	
	Filing Date	June 24, 2003	
	First Named Inventor	Thompson M. Sloane et al.	
	Art Unit	3748	
	Examiner Name	Zelalem Eshete	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission		Attorney Docket Number	GP-303216 (8540R-000038)

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Technology Center (TC) <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): Supplemental Reply Brief Filed Under 37 C.F.R. 41.43(b) and 41.41 and Return Postcard
Remarks		The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 07-0960. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT			
Firm or Individual name	Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.	Attorney Name	Anna M. Budde
		Reg. No.	35,085
Signature	<i>Anna M Budde</i>		
Date	January 19, 2007		

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.			
Typed or printed name	Anna M. Budde	Express Mail Label No.	EV 757 778 777 US (1/19/2007)
Signature	<i>Anna M Budde</i>	Date	January 19, 2007

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

EV 757 778 777 US



PATENT

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Application No.: 10/602,938
Filing Date: June 24, 2003
Applicant: Thompson M. Sloane, et al.
Group Art Unit: 3748
Examiner: Zelalem Eshete
Title: ACETYLENE-BASED ADDITION FOR
HOMOGENEOUS-CHARGE COMPRESSION IGNITION
(HCCI) ENGINE OPERATION
Attorney Docket: GP-303216 (8540R-000038)

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY BRIEF FILED UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 41.43(b) and 41.41

This is Applicants' Supplemental Reply to the Examiner's Answer mailed November 22, 2006.

Appellants respectfully file another reply brief to respond to the new arguments presented in the supplemental Examiner's Answer mailed November 22, 2006. Appellants maintain and assert once again their arguments from the Reply Brief filed August 21, 2006, and Appellants limit their additional comments set out in this Supplemental Reply Brief to the new Examiner's argument set out in the last paragraph on page 11 of the supplemental Examiner's Answer.

Supplemental Reply to Examiner's Arguments

Appellants reply that, with regard to claims 10, 11, 26, and 34, not only does the combination of the Dahung, Bundrick, and Gonzalez references lack any mention of ranges based on stoichiometry of the acetylene-based compound and its behavior in combination with fuel in a specialized HCCI engine, but the combination of these references also lacks any guidance for including acetylene in a charge to a compression ignition engine.

The Examiner's reliance on *In re Aller* is misplaced. In the *Aller* case, the claim at issue was to a process for decomposing isopropyl benzene hydroperoxide with 25-70% aqueous sulfuric acid at 40-80°C, while the reference taught decomposing isopropyl benzene hydroperoxide with 10% aqueous sulfuric acid at 100°C. *Aller*, 105 USPQ 233, 234 (CCPA 1955). The court said that a change in temperature or concentration of reactants would normally not be patentable, but may be patentable if such changes produced a new and unexpected result. *Id.* at 235. Unlike the *Aller* case, there is no single reference here that teaches a claimed method; there are no example methods laid out in the prior art with given parameters. There is no starting point for the automotive engineer to optimize.

The Dahung publication teaches using a pilot fuel to ignite a fuel than cannot be self-ignited (the), but this teaching would lead one to omit the pilot fuel entirely in the case of a HCCI engine, in which the fuel auto-ignites on compression. The Examiner cites the Bundrick patent teaches that many fluid fuels are known, and include acetylene. Still, following Dahung, one would not use the pilot fuel if the main fuel self-ignited. Furthermore, the Dahung publication handles high load conditions by introducing the main fuel into the combustion chamber before the pilot fuel, and,

alternatively, handles low load conditions by injecting the pilot fuel into the combustion chamber first, then the main fuel. Dahung, col. 2, line 47 to col. 3, line 16. Thus, the references teach that a pilot fuel is needed to fuel that does not self-ignite, and that the separate introduction of the pilot fuel (earlier or later) can control fuel ignition during different engine loads. The Gonzales patent further adds a spark plug-assisted ignition, in which the plug fires a spark at the same time as the pilot injection. Col. 5, lines 39-43.

The skilled artisan thus takes from these references a knowledge that a pilot gas is needed when a fuel that does not self-ignite is used, and that the introduction of the pilot gas can precede or follow introduction of the main fuel, or can be assisted in igniting the fuel with a spark plug.

There is no passage that mentions injection of concurrent injection, or adding a second, self-ignitable fuel to a fuel that already self-ignites, or, if that is done, how such fuels are apportioned in the combustion mixture. There is no basis on which to select either fuels or amounts — save random trial and error. This is a far cry from the situation in *Aller*, where an actual example of the reaction was set out, and the applicants merely varied reaction conditions in ways well-known to chemists. [The undersigned chemist can attest that effects of temperature and concentration of reactants on reaction rates are covered early and often in every chemist's education.] The present situation is instead like that of *In re O'Farrell*, 853 F.2d 849, 7 USPQ2d 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1988), where the engineer is left to “vary all parameters or try each of numerous possible choices until one possibly arrived at a successful result.” *Id.* at 903, 7 USPQ2d at 1681.

Also for these further considerations, then, Appellants respectfully request this Honorable Board to REVERSE the final rejection of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 19, 2007

By: Anna M. Budde

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

Anna M. Budde
Reg. No. 35,085

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:
Kathryn A. Marra
General Motors Corporation
Legal Staff - Mail Code 482-C23-B21
PO Box 300 - 300 Renaissance Center
Detroit, Michigan 48265-3000
Ph: 313-665-4708
Fax: 313-665-4976